

REMARKS

Claims 1, 5 and 7 have been amended. Claims 1 to 7 remain active in this application.

Claims 5 and 7 have been amended to correct the spelling error kindly noted by the Examiner.

Claims 1 to 4 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Leland et al. (U.S. 6,325,973) The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 requires, among other features, a fluid path having one or more fluidic conduits and an analyte detection chamber disposed along the fluid path having at least one interior surface adapted for derivatization. No such feature is taught or suggested by Leland et al. either alone or in the combination as claimed. While the Examiner has referred to Fig. 23 of Leland et al. to allegedly show this feature in conjunction with the specified portions of the specification, no such feature can be found in the cited subject matter. There is no mention of derivatization. According to “THESAURUSDICITIONARY.com”, the term “derivatize” is defined as –to alter the chemical composition [of a compound] by a chemical reaction which changes some part of the molecule, leaving most of the molecule unchanged--. No such feature is taught or suggested by Leland et al.

Claim 1 further requires a directed molecular interaction bias generator in fluidic communication with the analyte detection chamber for generating a bias across the chamber sufficient to move a desired analyte into a region proximate to the interior surface adapted for derivatization. No such feature is taught or suggested by Leland et al.

either alone or in the combination as claimed since there is no derivatization in Leland et al.

Claims 2 to 4 and 6 depend from claim 1 and therefore define patentably over Leland et al. for at least the reasons presented above with reference to claim 1.

In addition, claim 2 further limits claim 1 by requiring that the interior surface adapted for derivatization be a surface plasmon resonance detector. No such combination is taught or suggested by Leland et al.

Claim 3 further limits claim 2 by requiring that the surface adapted for derivatization be a surface plasmon resonance layer in optic communication with an integrally formed surface plasmon resonance sensor. No such combination is taught or suggested by Leland et al.

Claim 4 further limits claim 3 by requiring that the bias generator be electrical. No such combination is taught or suggested by Leland et al.

Claim 6 further limits claim 2 by requiring that the bias generator is magnetic. No such combination is taught or suggested by Leland et al.

Claims 5 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leland et al. in view of Gorgone et al. (U.S. 3,646,313). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 5 and 7 depend from claim 1 and therefore define patentably over the applied references for at least the reasons presented above with reference to claim 1 since Gorgone et al. fails to overcome the deficiencies in Leland et al. as demonstrated above.

In view of the above remarks, favorable reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'J. Cantor', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Jay M. Cantor
Reg. No. 19906
(301) 424-0355
(972) 917-5293